REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1 and 3-7 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, and 7 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

§103 Rejection of Claim 1 and 4 – 7

In Section 2 of the Office Action, claim 1 and 4 - 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redford *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,711,672; hereinafter referred to as "Redford") in view of Mernyk (U.S. Patent 6,496,206). Claims 1, 5, and 7 have been amended to address the rejection.

Regarding claim 1, as shown above, claim 1 has been amended and calls for:

> 1. (Currently Amended) An information processing apparatus for reading data from a detachable predetermined recording medium, comprising:
> loading detection means for detecting the loading of a recording medium into said information processing apparatus, wherein said recording medium stores data including one or more images, and each of said one or more images has a type;
> starting means for starting, in response to the loading of said recording medium detected by said loading detection means, a resident application program for processing said data stored on said recording medium, wherein said resident application program is already stored in said information processing apparatus before said recording medium is loaded into said information processing apparatus;
> unloading detection means for detecting the unloading of said recording medium from said information processing apparatus; and

ending means for ending, in response to the unloading of
said recording medium detected by said unloading detection
means, said resident application program;
wherein said resident application program reads one or
more of said one or more images from said recording medium and
generates a thumbnail image for said one or more read images
according to the type of said one or more read images so that said
thumbnail image presents a small image representation specific to
said one or more read images, and
wherein said one or more read images includes one or more
moving images and still images so that said thumbnail image for
said one or more moving images is generated from a first image
and said thumbnail image for said one or more still images is
generated from thumbnail data in a header of said one or more still
images.

Accordingly, in one aspect of claim 1, the resident application program generates a
thumbnail image according to the type of the read image(s). The resident application program
uses different generation processes for different types of images. For example, in one
implementation, the resident application program provides one process for MPEG, one for TIFF,
one for JPEG, and so on. The resulting thumbnail image reflects the corresponding image(s).
For example, in one implementation, for moving image data the thumbnail image is an image
based on the first image in the sequence of images in the moving image data, while for a still
image the thumbnail image is an image based on the still image (e.g., a smaller version of that
image). (See the Specification at page 25, and Figure 7.)

Using different generation processes, the resident application program advantageously
provides specific processing for multiple types of images. For example, for moving images, a
thumbnail image is generated from a first image, while for still images, a thumbnail image is
generated from thumbnail data in a header of the still image. Thus, by presenting the generated
thumbnail image, the resident application program advantageously provides an image

00253913

corresponding to the specific read image(s) and so makes it easier for a user to understand specifically what the thumbnail image represents.

By contrast, Redford discloses automatically starting execution and ending execution of process in a host device based on insertion and removal of a storage media in to the host device. Furthermore, Mernyk discloses opening every file in the folder and deriving thumbnail data therefrom. Thumbnail data for purely graphics file is derived by sampling the graphical data and thumbnail data for text-intensive file is derived by text-intensive means such as using "key words". Therefore, Redford and Mernyk, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations recited in claim 1.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is submitted that claim 1 should be allowable over Redford and Mernyk. Since independent claims 5-7 closely parallel, and include substantially similar limitations as recited in, claim 1, claims 5-7 should also be allowable over Redford and Mernyk. Further, since claim 4 depends from claim 1, claim 4 should be allowable over Redford and Mernyk.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1 and 4-7 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claim 3

In Section 5 of the Office Action, claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redford in view of Mernyk and further in view of Sato (U.S. Patent 6,067,398).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 1, and since claim 3 depends from claim 1, claim 3 should be allowable over Redford and Mernyk. Further, Sato was merely cited for disclosing an information processing apparatus where unloading of recording medium is restricted while the recording medium is being accessed. Therefore, Redford, Mernyk, and Sato, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations recited in claim 3.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 3 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1 and 3-7 is respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

00253913

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any

overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: _____

Samuel S. Lee
Reg. No. 42,791
(858) 731-5000

00253913